

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-16, 28, and 29 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 28, and 29 have been amended and claims 17-27 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and prompt early allowance are respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,161,126 to Wies *et al.* (hereinafter "Wies") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,605 to Conrad *et al.* (hereinafter "Conrad"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The references, even if combined, would not have resulted in the invention of independent claims 1, 7, and 28. Both references fail to show several features of the independent claims. Specifically, both references fail to teach or disclose an external component extends the behaviors of a core engine by participating with the core engine to provide behaviors of a like category, such as layout behaviors or rendering behaviors, in addition to the layout behaviors and rendering behaviors provided by a core engine. The external component behaviors may participate with the core engine behaviors by replacing or supplementing to the core engine behaviors of the like category as determined by communications between the core engine and the external component.

The Office Action alleges that Wies discloses the features of claim 1, but does not specifically disclose extending the behaviors of the core engine. The Office Action references Column 4, lines 45-48 of Conrad to illustrate extension of behaviors of the core engine.

Wies discloses a system for implementing “force feedback”. Force feedback allows a user to experience tactile sensations using computer controlled sensors and actuators on a force feedback device. The Wies system is particularly directed to implementing the force feedback experience in web pages. The Office Action references Column 23, lines 35-38 of Wies to show the external component and its participation with the core engine. This section of Wies describes Microsoft’s Active Accessibility system that provides enhanced functionality for users with disabilities. An active accessibility program runs on a client machine external to a web browser and is hooked into mouse moves. In contrast to the system of claim 1, the active accessibility program fails to participate with the core engine to provide additional functionality for a corresponding category of behavior such as a layout or rendering behavior as set forth in claim 1. Instead, the accessibility program provides an entirely different category of functionality that is not provided by the core engine to enable force feedback.

With regard to Conrad, Conrad discloses a plug-in, which as explained in the background of the invention of the present application on page 2, lines 8-19, does not participate with the core engine. Although a plug-in may provide capabilities not possessed by the core engine, the core engine delegates all functioning to the plug-in automatically and does not “participate” with the behaviors of the plug-in.

Accordingly, even if combined, the references fail to disclose a system that includes at least one external component designed to provide categories of external component behaviors including at least one of an external component layout behavior and an external component rendering behavior in addition to the behaviors provided by the core engine. Additionally, the references fail to disclose a mechanism included in the core engine to extend a selected category of behavior of the core engine with the behaviors of a same category of the at least one external

component, such that the behaviors of the same category of the at least one external component participate with the behaviors of the core engine, wherein the mechanism and the external component participate by communicating through the pair of interfaces. The references further fail to disclose a pair of interfaces associated with each external component for communication between the external component and the core engine.

In order to make out a prima facie case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must provide all of the elements of the invention as claimed and a suggestion to combine the disclosures of the various cited art references to make the claimed invention. *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686,688 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Additionally, Conrad fails to provide a teaching or suggestion for modifying Wies. No motivation would have existed to modify Wies to include a plug-in as disclosed by Conrad. Wies is directed to providing an entirely different category of functionality and not to extending existing capabilities of the core engine in a selected category of behavior. Accordingly, no motivation would have existing for adding a plug-in as disclosed by Conrad to the force effects system disclosed by Wies.

In order to make a prima facie case of obviousness, a teaching or suggestion of the combination must be found in the prior art. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Also, if a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and therefore define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to claim 7, the Office Action states that Wies discloses all features except for an initialization method. The Office action states that Conrad provides such an initialization method in Column 8, lines 16 and 17, and that it would have been obvious to modify Wies to provide such a method. However, Conrad fails to provide calling a behavior initialization method of the external component to determine how the behavior of the external component participates with the behavior of the core engine, wherein the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belong to the same category of behavior and participation includes supplementing core engine behavior with external component behavior if requested by the external component and participation includes replacing core engine behavior with external component behavior if requested by the external component. As noted in the Office Action, Wies also fails to provide this feature.

Both Wies and Conrad lack several features of claim 7. Accordingly, even if combined, Wies and Conrad would not have resulted in the invention of claim 7. Neither Wies nor Conrad discloses the initialization method as explained above. Furthermore, neither Wies nor Conrad discloses a method performed by a mechanism for extending a behavior of a core engine with a behavior of an external component, both the core engine behavior and the external component behavior belonging to a same category of behavior. Finally, neither reference discloses receiving a call to a corresponding behavior method of the mechanism for the external component to communicate with the core engine during participation of the behavior of the external component with the behavior of the core engine.

Claims 8-10, 12, 15, and 16 depend from independent claim 7 and are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7.

Claim 28 includes the features set forth above with respect to claim 1 and therefore defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is therefore also allowable over the art of record.

As explained above, Wies and Conrad fail to render obvious claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, 15, 16, 28, and 29. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejections of Claims 4-6, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 4-6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Conrad *et al.* as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Ramalay *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,585,777). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ramalay fails to obviate the deficiencies of Wies and Conrad noted above. Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and is allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Conrad *et al.* as applied to claim 12 and in further view of Merrick *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,219), in further view of Ramalay *et al.* and in further view of Lamping *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,324,551). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Merrick, Ramalay, and Lamping fail to obviate the deficiencies of Wies and Conrad noted above. Claim 13 depends from claim 7 and defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.* in view of Conrad *et al.* as applied to claim 12, in further view of Ramalay *et al.*, and in further view of Lamping *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,324,551). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Ramalay and Lamping fail to obviate the deficiencies of Wies and Conrad noted above. Claim 14 depends from claim 7. Accordingly, claim 14 defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 7. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Rejections of Claims 17-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Merrick *et al.*, in view of Lamping *et al.*, in further view of Barlow *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,275,935), and in further view of Luckenbaugh (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,877). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Merrick *et al.*, in view of Lamping *et al.*, in view of Barlow *et al.*, in view of Luckenbaugh, as applied to claim 17, and in further view of Conrad *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,605). Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Merrick *et al.*, and in further view of Luckenbaugh. Claims 25-27 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Merrick *et al.*, in view of Lamping *et al.*, in further view of Barlow *et al.*, and in further view of Luckenbaugh, as applied to claim 17, and in further view of Edelstein *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,537). Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wies *et al.*, in view of Conrad *et al.*, in view of Merrick *et al.*, as applied to claim 17, in further view of


Lamping *et al.*, in further view of Barlow *et al.*, in further view of Luckenbaugh and is further in view of Phillips *et al.* (U.S. Patent N. 6,442,618).

These rejections are moot, as claims 17-27 have been cancelled without prejudice of disclaimer. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and claims 1-16, 28, and 29 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner believes that any issues remain, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that are required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.19-2112 referencing MFCP 87510.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: August 20, 2004

Kerry H. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,412

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613  
Telephone (816) 474-6550  
Facsimile (816) 421-5547